



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,271	02/17/2004	Philip C. Hodge	110308.0005	2235
91103 7590 Moxon & Associates LLC Liberty Square Building 110 West Streetsboro Road Suites I.9, I.11 & I.12 Hudson, OH 44236			EXAMINER STEVENS, ROBERT	
			ART UNIT 2162	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/07/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/780,271

**Applicant(s)**

HODGE ET AL.

**Examiner**

ROBERT STEVENS

**Art Unit**

2162

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-16, 18, 19, 22-30, 32-34, 36-41, 43-45 and 47-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-16, 18, 19, 22-30, 32-34, 36-41, 43-45 and 47-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The Office withdraws the previous rejections of the claims under 35 USC §112-2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, in light of the amendment. However, the Office substantially maintains the previous rejections of the claims under 35 USC §103(a), in light of the amendment. Additionally, the Office sets forth new rejections of the claims under 35 USC §112-2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, in light of Applicant's arguments on page 13.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 2/24/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the previous rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112-2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, Applicant indicates on page 13 that the "structure of the claimed invention is conventional".

The Office withdraws the previous rejection of the claims under 35 USC §§112-2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

Regarding the previous rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103(a), Applicant discusses on pages 13-14 Applicant's inventive subject matter. E.g., generating a link in real time between an electronic document opened in a computer application and a target document, links not required to be "HTML", not requiring an HTTP server, and creating links in a spreadsheet/word processing document/database/flowchart.

The Office respectfully notes that such discussion is not set forth in the claim language.

Regarding the previous rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103(a), Applicant argues on pages 14-16 that the references do not teach updating links or opening/editing documents.

The Office respectfully disagrees, noting that the references as a whole teach the recited claim language. First, it is noted that Ferguson discusses the use of URL indexing at col. 6 lines 30-62, and generating links to new documents and modified document in col. 7 lines 47-57. It is further noted that Applicant's arguments directed to the Ferguson language that a link to a deleted document "may be" eliminated does not require deletion, but rather indicates a design option (as to whether or not to preserve the link). Additionally, it is noted that the same Ferguson passage discusses that a document may be modified. Such language is at least suggestive of opening/displaying/editing of a document.

Therefore, the references have been reasonably interpreted as teaching the recited claim language.

Applicant further argues on page 16 that the independent claims reciting substantially similar limitations, and all dependent claims are allowable for the reasons argued above.

The Office respectfully disagrees, and counter-asserts the rationale set forth above.

It is further noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-1333, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

The Office also notes MPEP § 2144.01, that quotes In re Preda, 401 F.2d 825, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968) as stating "in considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." Further MPEP 2123, states that "a reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including nonpreferred embodiments. Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989).

For at least these reasons, the Office asserts the rejections of the claims as set forth below.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. **Claims 1, 3-16, 18-19, 22-30, 32-34, 36-41, 43-45 and 47-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These claims are vague and ambiguous, and thus, their scope is indeterminable.

**Regarding independent claims 1, 27, 32-33, 40, 47 and 56:** Applicant argues on page 13 of the Amendment that Applicants “preserve the link when the linked document is deleted from the system”. Applicant further indicates that the claim language reflects that such link is “operable”. It is unclear how such link can be considered “operable” as it “links” to a document that no longer exists.

It is also unclear what the claimed links are, as Applicant discusses on page 14 that such links are “not limited to HTML” (a URL?), but can include C, Basic, etc. Applicant further argues on page 14 that the claimed hyperlinks are not “general links”, but it is unclear what a “C” language hyperlink is, for example.

**Claims 3-16, 18-19 and 22-26** depend upon claim 1, and therefore are likewise rejected.

**Claims 28-30** depend upon claim 27, and therefore are likewise rejected.

**Claims 34 and 36-39** depend upon claim 33, and therefore are likewise rejected.

**Claims 41 and 43-45** depend upon claim 40, and therefore are likewise rejected.

**Claims 48-55** depend upon claim 47, and therefore are likewise rejected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1, 3-16, 18-19, 22-30, 32-34, 36-41, 43-45 and 47-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0120729, filed as a continuation of Application no. 08/908544, which was filed on Aug. 7, 1997 and published on Jan. 26, 2003, hereafter referred to as “Kim”) in view of Ferguson et al. (US Patent No. 6,820,094, filed Oct. 8, 1997 and issued Nov. 16, 2004, hereafter referred to as “Ferguson”) and Grefenstette et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0205448, provisionally filed on Aug. 13, 2001 and published on Oct. 14, 2004, hereafter referred to as “Grefenstette”).

**Regarding independent claim 1:** Kim discloses

*A digital computer system, including a terminal and a data-management system for generating a hyper link in real time between an electronic document opened in a computer application and a target document, said digital computer terminal comprising a computer readable memory and a data-capture device,* (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format) *said data-management system comprising: data-capture logic for controlling capture of electronic data by said data-capture device;* (See Figure 4 #4 in Kim, showing the use of a scanner.) *target-document logic for generating said target document from said electronic data; and* (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file.) *link-generating logic for substantially simultaneously storing said target document in said computer readable memory and generating said hyper link to said target document in said electronic document in real time;* (See paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation and storage and noting that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which inherently required that the file be stored before being retrieved.) *data-management logic for transmitting said electronic document and said target document to a data storage device* (See paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing the storage of documents.)



However, Kim does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations. Ferguson, though, teaches *for opening, displaying, and editing said target document* (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving link generation due to “the modification of its corresponding document”. Additionally, it is noted that the same Ferguson passage discusses that a document may be modified. Such language is at least suggestive of opening/displaying/editing of a document.) *wherein said data management logic and said link editing logic automatically updates the path of said hyper link to maintain functionality of said hyper link and to render said hyper link operable following said transmission* Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving link generation due to “the modification of its corresponding document”).)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Additionally, Kim does not explicitly teach *and link-editing logic for updating a path of said hyper link*. Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295] discussing the dynamic updating of links.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Grefenstette for the benefit of Kim in view of Ferguson, because to do so provided a user with a system for enriching or supplementing the document that the user is accessing, as taught by Grefenstette in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

**Regarding claim 3:** Kim does not explicitly teach the use of top-level directories and subfolders. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See Figure 3 and column 4 lines 59-67 in Ferguson, illustrating the use of top-level folder and subdirectories. The specific data one arranged in a hierarchy was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.)

**Regarding claim 4:** Kim teaches the use of hard disk data storage. (See Figure 1 #3 in Kim, showing a file server computer, it having been well-known in the art that file server computers contain a hard drive.

**Regarding claim 5:** Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and printing documents.)

**Regarding claims 6-12:** Kim does not explicitly teach the recited limitations. Ferguson, though, suggests these limitations. (See column 10 lines 9-11 in Ferguson, discussing the processing of multipage documents, and column 15 lines 34-40, discussing the linking of a plurality of documents to/from a compound document. Establishing links, whether in a 1:1, 1:MANY, MANY:1 or MANY:MANY fashion, was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.)

**Regarding claim 13:** Kim does not explicitly teach link removal. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 7 lines 53-57 in Ferguson, discussing the removal of only the link.)

**Regarding claims 14-16 and 18-19:** Kim does not explicitly teach the recited limitations. Ferguson, though, suggests the use of an add-in. (See Figure 12 in Ferguson, showing the display results for a browser application add-in.) Ferguson also suggests the use of a data management system for text documents. (See the Abstract of Ferguson, discussing a document management application program, it having been an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention as to number of software modules and the location of specific functionality in each module.) Ferguson also suggests link-editing/ updating. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing the updating of an STG data storage file.) Ferguson teaches

the use of icons. (See column 12 lines 41-52 in Ferguson, discussing the use of icons to represent hyperlinks.)

**Regarding claim 22:** Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and printing documents.)

**Regarding claims 23-26:** Kim does not explicitly teach the recited limitations. Ferguson, though, suggests these limitations. (See column 10 lines 9-11, discussing the processing of multipage documents, and column 15 lines 34-40, discussing the linking of a plurality of documents to/from a compound document. Establishing links, whether in a 1:1, 1:MANY, MANY:1 or MANY:MANY fashion, was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.)

**Regarding independent claim 27:** Kim discloses

*A data-management system for generating a plurality of links to target documents in an electronic document,* (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format) *said data-management*

*system comprising: means for creating and editing an electronic document; means for generating a plurality of target documents from electronic data captured by a data-capture device;* (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file object.) *means for storing said plurality of captured target documents in a computer readable memory; and means for generating a link at a plurality of user-selected locations in said electronic document to said plurality of captured target documents.* (See paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation and storage and noting that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which inherently required that the file be stored before being retrieved.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach editing, generation of a plurality of documents or use of sequential identifiers. Ferguson, though, suggests editing (e.g., *for opening, displaying, and editing said target document*). (See column 12 lines 8-15 in Ferguson, discussing an edit menu and editing functions. See also col. 3 lines 22-25 discussing the use of a general purpose computer. Additionally, it is noted that the Ferguson column 7 lines 47-57 discusses that a document may be modified. Such language is at least suggestive of opening/displaying/editing of a document.) Ferguson also suggests the generation of a plurality of target documents. (See column 15 lines 30-39 in Ferguson, discussing clipped documents being formed from a plurality of documents such as images, Word documents and HTML files, and column 15 line 63 – column 16 line 6, discussing links to a compound document from each component target document.) Ferguson further suggests the use of sequential identifiers for targets. (See column 5 lines 1-15 in Ferguson, discussing the sequential numbering of documents [e.g., D<sub>1</sub>, D<sub>2</sub>, etc.].)

Ferguson also suggests *and to render said hyper link operable following said transmission* (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving link generation due to “the modification of its corresponding document”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Additionally, Kim does not explicitly teach *means for updating a path of said plurality of hyperlinks in a user selected range of said electronic document*. Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295] discussing the dynamic updating of links.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Grefenstette for the benefit of Kim in view of Ferguson, because to do so provided a user with a system for enriching or supplementing the document that the user is accessing, as taught by Grefenstette in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

**Regarding claim 28:** Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and printing documents.

**Regarding claim 29:** Kim teaches “transmitting” documents to storage. (See paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing storage of documents.) However, Kim does not explicitly teach updating link paths. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving updates requiring link elimination.)

**Claim 30** is substantially similar to claim 3, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding independent claim 32:** Kim discloses

*A computer system for linking a target document to a portion of an electronic document in real time* (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing automatic link generation to a scanned document file), *said computer system comprising: a computer for generating and editing an electronic document;* (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing the use of a scanner and generation of an electronic file.) *link-generating logic operable with said computer application for generating a link to said target document, wherein said target document is an electronic reproduction of a hardcopy document and is to be generated by scanning said hardcopy*

*document with an optical data-capture device, further wherein said link is to be generated at approximately the same time as said captured target document is to be saved, and further wherein said computer application is one of a group consisting of a spreadsheet, word processor, database, presentation application, and any combination thereof.* (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Ferguson, discussing a browser application and automatic link generation to an HTML page and storage, in context of [0005], discussing the scanning of paper documents using an optical data-capture device such as a scanner. It is noted that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which requires that the file be stored.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach editing. Ferguson, though, suggests editing. (e.g., *for opening, displaying, and editing said target document*). (See column 12 lines 8-15 in Ferguson, discussing an edit menu and editing functions. See also col. 3 lines 22-25 discussing the use of a general purpose computer. Additionally, it is noted that the Ferguson column 7 lines 47-57 discusses that a document may be modified. Such language is at least suggestive of opening/displaying/editing of a document.) Ferguson also suggests the generation of a plurality of target documents. (See column 15 lines 30-39 in Ferguson, discussing clipped documents being formed from a plurality of documents such as images, Word documents and HTML files, and column 15 line 63 – column 16 line 6, discussing links to a compound document from each component target document.) Ferguson further suggests the use of sequential identifiers for targets. (See column 5 lines 1-15 in Ferguson, discussing the sequential numbering of documents [e.g., D<sub>1</sub>, D<sub>2</sub>, etc.].) Ferguson also suggests *and to render said hyper link operable following said transmission* (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the



STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving link generation due to “the modification of its corresponding document”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Additionally, Kim does not explicitly teach *and link-editing logic for updating a path of said link*; Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295] discussing the dynamic updating of links.) *and the link is automatically updated* Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295] discussing the dynamic updating of links.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Grefenstette for the benefit of Kim in view of Ferguson, because to do so provided a user with a system for enriching or supplementing the document that the user is accessing, as taught by Grefenstette in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

**Regarding independent claim 33:** Kim discloses

*A data-management system for linking a portion of an electronic document to a target document,* (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing linking an input image) *said data-management system comprising: a data-capture device for capturing electronic data representing an information object;* (See Figure 4 #4 in Kim, showing the use of a scanner.) *means for generating said target document from said electronic data;* (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file.) *a computer readable memory to store said target document; and* (See paragraph [0014] in Kim, which discusses the retrieval of the created image file, which required that the file be stored before being retrieved. It is inherent that such data storage required a computer readable memory.) *means for storing said target document in said computer readable memory and generating a link to said target document in said electronic document;* (See paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation and storage and noting that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which inherently required that the file be stored before being retrieved.) *means for transmitting said electronic document and said target document to a data storage device;* (See paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing the storage of documents.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach the remaining claim language. Ferguson, though, suggests editing (e.g., *for opening, displaying, and editing said target document*). (See column 12 lines 8-15 in Ferguson, discussing an edit menu and editing functions. See also col. 3 lines 22-25 discussing the use of a general purpose computer. Additionally, it is noted that the Ferguson column 7 lines 47-57 discusses that a document may be modified. Such language is at

least suggestive of opening/displaying/editing of a document.) Ferguson also suggests the generation of a plurality of target documents. (See column 15 lines 30-39 in Ferguson, discussing clipped documents being formed from a plurality of documents such as images, Word documents and HTML files, and column 15 line 63 – column 16 line 6, discussing links to a compound document from each component target document.) Ferguson also suggests *wherein said transmitting means automatically updates a path of said link to render said link operable following transmission*. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving link generation due to “the modification of its corresponding document”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Additionally, Kim does not explicitly teach *and means for updating a path of said plurality of hyperlinks in a user-selected range of said electronic document*; Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295] discussing the dynamic updating of links.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Grefenstette for the benefit of Kim in view of Ferguson, because to do

so provided a user with a system for enriching or supplementing the document that the user is accessing, as taught by Grefenstette in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

**Regarding claim 34:** Kim teaches the use of a scanner. (See paragraph [0012] of Kim.)

**Claims 36-37** are substantially similar to claims 3-4, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected. It is further noted that the exact “means” (e.g., hardware or software element) in which a particular functionality was implemented, was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.

**Regarding claims 38-39:** Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32, discussing a utility for viewing and printing documents.)

**Regarding independent claim 40:** Kim discloses  
*An electronic-document management method for creating and managing an electronic document having a link to a target document in a computer application,* (See the Abstract and

paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format) *said method comprising the steps of: generating a target document from electronic data representing an information object captured by a data-capture device; and* (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file object.) *storing said target document in a computer readable memory and generating said link at said user-selected location in said electronic document.* (See paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation and storage and noting that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which inherently required that the file be stored before being retrieved.) *transmitting said electronic document and said target document to a data storage device upon receiving a command from a user;* (See paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing the storage of documents.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach *and updating a path of said link to render said link operable after said transmission*. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving link generation due to “the modification of its corresponding document”). Ferguson also suggests editing (e.g., *for opening, displaying, and editing said target document*). (See column 12 lines 8-15 in Ferguson, discussing an edit menu and editing functions. See also col. 3 lines 22-25 discussing the use of a general purpose computer. Additionally, it is noted that the Ferguson column 7 lines 47-57 discusses that a document may be modified. Such language is at least suggestive of opening/displaying/editing

of a document.) Ferguson also suggests the generation of a plurality of target documents. (See column 15 lines 30-39 in Ferguson, discussing clipped documents being formed from a plurality of documents such as images, Word documents and HTML files, and column 15 line 63 – column 16 line 6, discussing links to a compound document from each component target document. It is further noted that the storage of such a document merely reflects an intended use of stored data/document.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Additionally, Kim does not explicitly teach *and updating the path of said link* Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295] discussing the dynamic updating of links.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Grefenstette for the benefit of Kim in view of Ferguson, because to do so provided a user with a system for enriching or supplementing the document that the user is accessing, as taught by Grefenstette in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

**Regarding claim 41:** Kim does not explicitly teach document viewing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See Figure 1 element #169 and column 11 lines 28-32 in Ferguson, discussing document viewing.)

**Claim 43** is substantially similar to claim 3, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 44:** Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and printing documents.)

**Claim 45** is substantially similar to claim 18, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding independent claim 47:** Kim discloses

*An electronic-document management method for creating and managing an electronic document having a plurality of links to target documents in a computer application,* (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format. It was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include more than one link.) *said method comprising the steps of: generating a plurality of target documents from electronic data representing one or more information*

*objects captured by a data-capture device;* (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file object.) *generating one or more links to the target documents in said electronic document.* (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format. It was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include more than one link.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach editing, generation of a plurality of documents or use of sequential identifiers. Ferguson, though, suggests editing (e.g., *for opening, displaying, and editing said target document*). (See column 12 lines 8-15 in Ferguson, discussing an edit menu and editing functions. See also col. 3 lines 22-25 discussing the use of a general purpose computer. Additionally, it is noted that the Ferguson column 7 lines 47-57 discusses that a document may be modified. Such language is at least suggestive of opening/displaying/editing of a document.) Ferguson also suggests the generation of a plurality of target documents. (See column 15 lines 30-39 in Ferguson, discussing clipped documents being formed from a plurality of documents such as images, Word documents and HTML files, and column 15 line 63 – column 16 line 6, discussing links to a compound document from each component target document.) Ferguson further suggests the use of sequential identifiers for targets. (See column 5 lines 1-15 in Ferguson, discussing the sequential numbering of documents [e.g., D<sub>1</sub>, D<sub>2</sub>, etc.].) Ferguson also suggests *and render said hyper link operable following said transmission* (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context



of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving link generation due to “the modification of its corresponding document”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Additionally, Kim does not explicitly teach *and updating the path of said link*. Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295] discussing the dynamic updating of links.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Grefenstette for the benefit of Kim in view of Ferguson, because to do so provided a user with a system for enriching or supplementing the document that the user is accessing, as taught by Grefenstette in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

**Claims 48-49** are substantially similar to claim 42 and claim 3, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 50:** Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and printing documents.)

**Regarding claim 51:** Kim does not explicitly teach the use of icons. Ferguson teaches the use of icons. (See column 12 lines 41-52 in Ferguson, discussing the use of icons to represent links.)

**Regarding claim 52:** Kim does not explicitly teach updating link paths. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving updates requiring link elimination.)

**Regarding claim 53:** Kim does not explicitly teach user selected link locations, comparing the number of locations with the number of documents to be linked and generating a link for each document. Ferguson, though, suggests these limitations. (See column 9 lines 51-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the importing documents, and column 9 lines 27-31, discussing the linking of multiple documents.)

**Claims 54-55** are substantially similar to claims 24-25, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding independent claim 56:** Kim discloses

*A data-management system for generating a hyperlink in real time between a portion of an electronic document opened in a computer application and a target document,* (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format. It was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include more than one link.) *said system comprising: a digital computer terminal comprising a computer readable memory and a data-capture device;* (See Figure 2 #88 and #82 of Kim) *data-capture logic in communication with said digital computer terminal for controlling capture of electronic data by said data-capture device;* (See The Kim Figure 2 #80, 81 and 82, in context of paragraph [0012] discussing the use of a scanner.) *target-document logic in communication with said digital computer terminal for generating said target document from said electronic data;* (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing generation of a target document via a scanning process for display in a browser.) *link-generating logic in communication with said digital computer terminal for storing said target document in said computer readable memory and generating said link to said target document in said electronic document in real time;* (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format. It was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include more than one link.) *data-management logic for transmitting said electronic document and said target document to a*

*data storage device.* (See paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing the storage of documents.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach *wherein said data-management logic automatically updates a path of said link to maintain functionality of said link following said transmission.* Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving link generation due to “the modification of its corresponding document”.) Additionally, Kim does not explicitly teach editing. Ferguson, though, suggests editing (e.g., *for opening, displaying, and editing said target document*). (See column 12 lines 8-15 in Ferguson, discussing an edit menu and editing functions. See also col. 3 lines 22-25 discussing the use of a general purpose computer. Additionally, it is noted that the Ferguson column 7 lines 47-57 discusses that a document may be modified. Such language is at least suggestive of opening/displaying/editing of a document.) Ferguson also suggests the generation of a plurality of target documents. (See column 15 lines 30-39 in Ferguson, discussing clipped documents being formed from a plurality of documents such as images, Word documents and HTML files, and column 15 line 63 – column 16 line 6, discussing links to a compound document from each component target document.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate

and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Additionally, Kim does not explicitly teach *link-editing logic for updating a path of said link*; Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295] discussing the dynamic updating of links.) *and said link updating logic for updating a path of said link automatically updates a path of said link to maintain functionality of said link following said transmission.* Grefenstette, though, suggests this limitation. (See Grefenstette paragraph [0295] discussing the dynamic updating of links.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Grefenstette for the benefit of Kim in view of Ferguson, because to do so provided a user with a system for enriching or supplementing the document that the user is accessing, as taught by Grefenstette in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

***Non-Patent Literature***

Nguyen, Tien N., et al., "The Software Concordance: A New Software Document Management Software", SIGDOC '03, San Francisco, CA, Oct. 12-15, 2003, pp. 198-204.

Baker, Scott M., et al., "Distributed Cooperative Web Servers", Proc. of the 8<sup>th</sup> International World Wide Web Conf., Toronto, Canada, May 1999, pp. 137-151.

Ginsburg, Mark, "An Agent Framework for Internet Document Management", Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems, Vol. 2, No. 3, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Sep. 1999, pp. 271-286.

Phelps, Thomas A., et al., "Robust Hyperlinks Cost Just Five Words Each", Univ. of California at Berkeley Technical Report CSD-00-1091, Berkeley, CA, © 2000, pp. 1-12.

***US Patent Application Publications***

Rao et al	2008/0133716
Shanahan et al	2005/0022114
Tsai	2004/0046997
Gallagher et al	2003/0204522
Kraft	2003/0018669

***US Patents***

Hennings et al	6,763,496
Fritz et al	6,430,563
Fritz et al	6,134,552
Matthews et al	6,025,837
Tsai	6,678,864
Combs	6,138,129
Greer et al	5,978,828
Ferguson et al	5,819,092

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert Stevens/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162

June 4, 2010